UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE United States Patent and Trademark Office Address: COMMISSIONER FOR PATENTS P.O. Box 1450 Alexandria, Virginia 22313-1450 www.uspto.gov

APPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO.
10/574,740	01/22/2007	Patrick Schweizer	MA1WAM7.005APC	1910
	7590	EXAMINER		
2040 MAIN ST		IBRAHIM, MEDINA AHMED		
FOURTEENTH IRVINE, CA 92		ART UNIT	PAPER NUMBER	
			1638	
			NOTIFICATION DATE	DELIVERY MODE
			05/15/2009	ELECTRONIC

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

The time period for reply, if any, is set in the attached communication.

Notice of the Office communication was sent electronically on above-indicated "Notification Date" to the following e-mail address(es):

jcartee@kmob.com eOAPilot@kmob.com

Advisory Action Before the Filing of an Appeal Brief

Application No.	Applicant(s)	
10/574,740	SCHWEIZER ET AL.	
Examiner	Art Unit	

	Medina A. Ibrahim	1638					
The MAILING DATE of this communication appe	ars on the cover sheet with the c	correspondence add	ress				
THE REPLY FILED 02 March 2009 FAILS TO PLACE THIS APPLICATION IN CONDITION FOR ALLOWANCE.							
1. The reply was filed after a final rejection, but prior to or on application, applicant must timely file one of the following application in condition for allowance; (2) a Notice of Appel for Continued Examination (RCE) in compliance with 37 Coperiods:	replies: (1) an amendment, affidavit eal (with appeal fee) in compliance	t, or other evidence, w with 37 CFR 41.31; or	which places the (3) a Request				
a) The period for reply expires <u>3</u> months from the mailing date	of the final rejection.						
b) The period for reply expires on: (1) the mailing date of this A no event, however, will the statutory period for reply expire is	ater than SIX MONTHS from the mailing	date of the final rejection	on.				
Examiner Note: If box 1 is checked, check either box (a) or (b). ONLY CHECK BOX (b) WHEN THE FIRST REPLY WAS FILED WITHIN TWO MONTHS OF THE FINAL REJECTION. See MPEP 706.07(f).							
Extensions of time may be obtained under 37 CFR 1.136(a). The date on which the petition under 37 CFR 1.136(a) and the appropriate extension fee have been filed is the date for purposes of determining the period of extension and the corresponding amount of the fee. The appropriate extension fee under 37 CFR 1.17(a) is calculated from: (1) the expiration date of the shortened statutory period for reply originally set in the final Office action; or (2) as set forth in (b) above, if checked. Any reply received by the Office later than three months after the mailing date of the final rejection, even if timely filed, may reduce any earned patent term adjustment. See 37 CFR 1.704(b).							
NOTICE OF APPEAL	Page 101 07 0FD 44 07	91-1-10k! (0k	61b 1 (6				
 The Notice of Appeal was filed on A brief in comp filing the Notice of Appeal (37 CFR 41.37(a)), or any exter Notice of Appeal has been filed, any reply must be filed with AMENDMENTS 	nsion thereof (37 CFR 41.37(e)), to	avoid dismissal of the	s of the date of e appeal. Since a				
3. The proposed amendment(s) filed after a final rejection, b	out prior to the date of filing a brief.	will not be entered be	cause				
(a) They raise new issues that would require further cor	nsideration and/or search (see NOT	E below);					
(b) ☐ They raise the issue of new matter (see NOTE below); (c) ☐ They are not deemed to place the application in better form for appeal by materially reducing or simplifying the issues for appeal; and/or							
(d) They present additional claims without canceling a c	corresponding number of finally reje	cted claims.					
NOTE: See Continuation Sheet. (See 37 CFR 1.1	16 and 41.33(a)).						
4. The amendments are not in compliance with 37 CFR 1.12		mpliant Amendment (PTOL-324).				
5. Applicant's reply has overcome the following rejection(s):							
non-allowable claim(s).							
7. Solution For purposes of appeal, the proposed amendment(s): a) Solution will not be entered, or b) solution will be entered and an explanation of how the new or amended claims would be rejected is provided below or appended. The status of the claim(s) is (or will be) as follows:							
Claim(s) allowed:							
Claim(s) objected to: Claim(s) rejected: 1-18 and 21-32.							
Claim(s) withdrawn from consideration:							
AFFIDAVIT OR OTHER EVIDENCE							
8. The affidavit or other evidence filed after a final action, but before or on the date of filing a Notice of Appeal will <u>not</u> be entered because applicant failed to provide a showing of good and sufficient reasons why the affidavit or other evidence is necessary and was not earlier presented. See 37 CFR 1.116(e).							
9. The affidavit or other evidence filed after the date of filing entered because the affidavit or other evidence failed to o showing a good and sufficient reasons why it is necessary	vercome <u>all</u> rejections under appea	l and/or appellant fail:	s to provide a				
10. The affidavit or other evidence is entered. An explanation of the status of the claims after entry is below or attached. REQUEST FOR RECONSIDERATION/OTHER							
11. The request for reconsideration has been considered but does NOT place the application in condition for allowance because: See Continuation Sheet.							
12. Note the attached Information <i>Disclosure Statement</i> (s). (PTO/SB/08) Paper No(s) 13. Other:							
	/Medina A Ibrahim/ Primary Examiner, Art U	nit 1638					
	i initially Examinion, Alt O						

Continuation of 3. NOTE: the recitation 98% is a new matter and requires further consideration.

Continuation of 11. does NOT place the application in condition for allowance because: the amendment introduces new matter into the claims because 98% sequence identity to SEQ ID NO: 1, 2 or 3 has no basis in the specification or in the claims as originally filed. verbiage." Applicant refers to in re Wertheim, 541 f.2d 257 (C.C.P.A. 1976) to support the amendment. In re Wertheim, the ranges described in the original specification included a range of 25% to 60% and specific examples of 36% and 50%. A corresponding new claim limitation to "at least 35%" did not meet the description requirement because the phrase "at least" had no upper limit and caused a claim to read literally on embodiments outside "25% to 60%" range; however, a limitation to "between 35% and 60%" did meet the description requirement. In the instant application, there is no range limitation and no corresponding narrowing range limitation is recited. Therefore, the at least 98% constitutes a new matter.